

(Imperfectly) Defining Reality: Our Human Quest to Construct Reality from Science

(Imperfectly) Defining Reality

Our Human Quest to Construct Reality from Science

Rowan Brad Quni, QNFO

Science has established a counterproductive imperative to “define” any/everything (e.g. absolute zero vs. zero-point energy, constant-yet-relative speed of light) before we actually understand how the universe works. Yes, all models are wrong, but we enshrine ours like theology.

This inherent drive within the scientific method, particularly as it solidified during the Enlightenment and the subsequent rise of positivism, prioritizes the operationalization and quantification of phenomena. The need for repeatable experiments, shared understanding among researchers, and the construction of predictive frameworks necessitates the creation of precise, often rigid, definitions. Concepts must be pinned down, assigned measurable attributes, and fitted into logical structures. This impulse, deeply rooted in a particular epistemology that values empirical observation and logical analysis as the primary path to knowledge, forms the bedrock of modern scientific practice. It reflects a desire to carve nature into discrete, manageable units that can be isolated, studied, and manipulated. This quest for objective definition is not merely a practical necessity for communication; it embodies a philosophical stance, often implicitly realist, suggesting that these definitions correspond to fundamental, mind-independent features of reality. This aligns with traditional scientific realism, which posits that successful scientific theories literally describe an external, objective reality. Historically, this drive can be traced back not only to Enlightenment empiricism (figures like Locke and Hume emphasizing sensory experience) but also finds echoes in rationalist attempts (like Descartes and Leibniz) to build knowledge deductively from clear and distinct ideas, laying groundwork for a systematic, definition-based approach. Immanuel Kant, while critiquing pure reason's ability to grasp noumenal reality, nonetheless proposed inherent cognitive structures (categories of understanding like causality, substance, space, time) through which we *must* process phenomenal experience, suggesting a perhaps unavoidable human tendency to impose structure and definition onto the perceived world through our innate cognitive apparatus. More recently, logical positivism, with its emphasis on verificationism and the meaningfulness of statements only if empirically verifiable, further cemented the focus on operationally defined terms grounded in observable data, pushing science towards a language where every concept ideally corresponds to a measurable operation or a directly observable entity. Percy Bridgman's concept of operationalism explicitly argued that a physical concept is nothing more than the set of operations used to measure it, a philosophy that profoundly influenced fields like physics and psychology, reinforcing the definitional imperative. The very structure of scientific inquiry, often proceeding by breaking down complex systems into simpler parts to define their properties in isolation (reductionism), inherently relies on the ability to draw clear conceptual boundaries around these parts. This contrasts markedly with pre-modern or scholastic approaches, which often relied more on teleological explanations (defining things by their purpose or final cause, rooted in Aristotelian physics) or essentialism (defining things by their inherent, often non-empirical, 'essence'), highlighting a historical shift towards defining phenomena by their measurable attributes and observable behaviors rather than their intrinsic nature or ultimate function. The scientific revolution itself can be viewed, in part, as a triumph of operational and mathematical definition over these earlier modes of understanding, facilitated by the development of new measurement tools and the language of mathematics providing a means for precise, abstract definition and manipulation of concepts. The increasing reliance on mathematics provided a powerful tool for creating abstract, yet rigorous, definitions that could be manipulated logically and tested against quantitative data, further solidifying the definitional imperative.

This mathematical formalization often leads to definitions based on axioms and logical deduction, creating internally consistent systems that may or may not fully map onto the empirical world, a point of tension between formal rigor and empirical fidelity. The aesthetic appeal and perceived universality of mathematical structures can sometimes lead to their reification, where mathematical definitions are treated as more “real” than the phenomena they describe, a form of mathematical Platonism influencing scientific practice.

However, this fervent pursuit of definitive boundaries and fixed conceptual anchors can indeed become counterproductive. By demanding precise definitions *before* a comprehensive, systemic understanding has been achieved, science risks creating intellectual straitjackets. Premature reification of concepts—treating abstract models or provisional definitions as if they were concrete, immutable aspects of reality itself—can blind researchers to phenomena that lie outside these predefined boxes or that emerge from interactions between what have been artificially separated and defined entities. This is particularly problematic when dealing with complex systems, where properties often arise from the relationships and interactions between components rather than residing solely within the components themselves. Rigid, component-based definitions struggle to capture emergent behavior, non-linear dynamics, or phase transitions. The examples cited, such as the tension between the theoretical limit of absolute zero (a classical thermodynamic definition representing the state of minimum energy in a system, implying cessation of particle motion according to the equipartition theorem) and the quantum mechanical zero-point energy (a consequence of the uncertainty principle, specifically $\Delta x \cdot \Delta p \geq \frac{\hbar}{2}$, and quantum fluctuations inherent in the vacuum itself, implying that even at 0 Kelvin, particles within a confined system retain irreducible motion and energy, preventing them from settling into a state of absolute rest with zero momentum), highlight how rigid definitions rooted in one theoretical framework can clash with insights from another, revealing the provisional and context-dependent nature of these conceptual boundaries. The classical definition of ‘rest’ or ‘zero energy’ is rendered incomplete, if not misleading, by quantum mechanics, demonstrating how a definitional framework valid at one scale or conceptual level breaks down at another. Absolute zero, defined classically as the temperature where entropy reaches its minimum value (Third Law of Thermodynamics) and particles cease motion, is fundamentally challenged by the quantum mechanical prediction that a system at 0 Kelvin still possesses a non-zero minimum energy (the zero-point energy), observable in phenomena like the non-freezing of liquid helium under pressure at absolute zero or the Casimir effect, which arises from vacuum fluctuations. Similarly, the “constant-yet-relative” nature of the speed of light encapsulates the profound conceptual strain introduced by Special Relativity. While the speed of light c is defined as a universal constant invariant for all inertial observers (a foundational postulate of SR), the very quantities from which speed is derived—time intervals ($\Delta t'$, dilated via $t' = \gamma t$) and spatial distances ($\Delta x'$, contracted via $x' = x/\gamma$)—are shown to be relative to the observer’s frame of reference according to the Lorentz transformations. This isn’t just a measurement issue; it’s a fundamental challenge to classical, absolute definitions of space, time, simultaneity, inertial mass (which becomes relativistic mass or is subsumed into energy-momentum), and even causality when considering events across different frames. The definition of “simultaneity” itself, seemingly intuitive in classical physics, becomes relative and frame-dependent in SR, requiring a complete redefinition. These paradoxes and points of friction arise precisely because the universe resists being neatly packaged into our defined conceptual containers, especially when those containers are based on incomplete, scale-limited, or framework-specific perspectives. Other domains face similar definitional crises: biology grapples with defining “life” at its boundaries (viruses, prions, artificial life, the transition from complex chemistry, the status of organelles or endosymbionts), medicine with “health” or “disease” in the context of chronic conditions, mental health, subjective well-being, and the microbiome (where the “individual” becomes a complex ecosystem), and cognitive science with “consciousness” or “intelligence,” concepts that resist simple operationalization and may be fundamentally relational, emergent, or even system-dependent, potentially requiring definitions based on informational integration or complex functional criteria rather than simple attributes. Geology struggles with precisely defining geological eras or boundaries when processes are continuous rather than discrete events, leading

to GSSP (Global Boundary Stratotype Section and Point) definitions that are often debated and refined, relying on specific markers in rock strata rather than universally sharp transitions. Ecology faces challenges defining ecosystem boundaries (often arbitrary lines on a map for fundamentally interconnected systems) or even what constitutes an individual organism in symbiotic relationships, colonial organisms (like corals or slime molds), or clonal plants. Physics itself continues to grapple with fundamental definitions: What is a particle vs. a field? The Standard Model defines particles as excitations of quantum fields, blurring the classical distinction. What constitutes a “measurement” in quantum mechanics, and does it require a conscious observer or merely interaction with a macroscopic system (the measurement problem)? How do we define “dark matter” or “dark energy” beyond their gravitational effects, lacking a direct empirical definition of their composition or fundamental nature? Cosmology struggles to define the “beginning” of the universe (the singularity at $t=0$ in the Big Bang model) within current physics, where our definitions of space, time, and matter density break down, suggesting the need for a more fundamental theory (like quantum gravity) that might redefine these concepts entirely near Planck scales. Even in seemingly more concrete fields like materials science, defining a “phase” or “state of matter” becomes complex at transitions, critical points, or for exotic states like plasmas, superfluids, Bose-Einstein condensates, or topological phases, which require definitions based on collective behavior and topological properties rather than simple notions of solid, liquid, gas. In social sciences, defining concepts like “social class,” “culture,” “identity,” “power,” or “rationality” involves deep theoretical disagreements and boundary problems, highlighting the inherent difficulty in applying rigid definitions to fluid, context-dependent, and subjectively experienced human phenomena. The drive to define, while enabling initial progress by segmenting the problem space and providing a common language, can impede deeper understanding by hindering the recognition of connectivity, contextuality, fuzzy boundaries, scale-dependence, and the dynamic nature of phenomena that defy crisp categorization. It can lead to the dismissal of “anomalies” that don’t fit the current definitions, slowing down the recognition of fundamentally new physics or biological principles, as seen historically with phenomena like blackbody radiation or the photoelectric effect challenging classical definitions of light and energy. This is the essence of a “boundary problem” in science—where the edges of our defined categories become blurred or break down, revealing the limitations of the definitions themselves and signaling the need for conceptual revision or entirely new frameworks. The process of scientific discovery often involves encountering phenomena that defy existing definitions, forcing a re-evaluation and refinement, or sometimes complete abandonment, of established concepts. This dynamic tension between the need for definition and the resistance of reality to be defined fuels scientific progress when navigated effectively, but can cause stagnation when definitions become too rigid. The very act of defining implies drawing a boundary, creating an inside and an outside, a distinction that may be artificial when dealing with continuous spectra, nested hierarchies, or deeply entangled systems.

The assertion that “all models are wrong, but some are useful” is a widely accepted aphorism within science (often attributed to George Box), acknowledging the inherent limitations of abstract representations in fully capturing the complexity of reality. Yet, the subsequent behavior often belies this humility. Scientific models and the definitions embedded within them, once established and successful within a certain domain, frequently acquire a status akin to dogma. They become entrenched paradigms, fiercely defended not only through empirical validation (which is necessary) but also through powerful sociological, psychological, and institutional forces. This “enshrinement,” reminiscent of theological adherence to scripture or doctrine, can impede the revolutionary shifts necessary for progress, as vividly described by Thomas Kuhn in his structure of scientific revolutions. “Normal science” operates within a defined paradigm, solving puzzles based on its accepted definitions, laws, and models. Anomalies that challenge these foundational concepts are often initially dismissed, reinterpreted to fit the existing framework, or marginalized as inconvenient outliers, sometimes for decades, until their accumulation triggers a crisis. The reward system in academia—funding success heavily favoring proposals within established fields, publication bias towards results confirming existing theories in high-impact journals, career advancement tied to reputation within the

established community, peer recognition and citations—heavily favors work that extends or confirms existing paradigms rather than challenging them fundamentally. The peer review system, while essential for quality control and filtering out poor methodology, can also act as a conservative force, filtering out ideas that are too unconventional, challenge core definitions, or originate from outside the established network, sometimes leading to the suppression or delayed acceptance of genuinely novel approaches. Textbooks codify current definitions and models, shaping the understanding of new generations of scientists within the established orthodoxy, often presenting current understanding as settled fact rather than provisional knowledge or one possible interpretation. Scientific conferences and professional societies often reinforce dominant narratives and definitional frameworks through invited talks, session structures, award criteria, and informal networking that perpetuates groupthink. The media, seeking clear narratives and often lacking the nuance to explain scientific uncertainty or definitional debates, tends to report on scientific findings within established paradigms, rarely highlighting the foundational definitional debates or the provisional nature of knowledge. This collective psychological drive for certainty, stability, and consensus, coupled with the sociological structures and power dynamics of the scientific community, leads to the defense of current definitions and models with a fervor that can mirror faith more than dispassionate, provisional inquiry. Confirmation bias leads researchers to seek out and interpret evidence that supports existing definitions and theories, while cognitive dissonance makes it uncomfortable to confront data that squarely contradicts deeply held conceptual frameworks. The sunk cost fallacy can manifest as a reluctance to abandon research programs built upon a foundation of definitions that are proving inadequate or to invest in exploring phenomena that fall outside the scope of currently funded and recognized areas. The provisional nature of scientific knowledge, ideally a cornerstone of its methodology, is often overshadowed by this deep-seated human need for stable conceptual ground and the institutional inertia of the scientific enterprise. This dynamic transforms useful, albeit imperfect, tools for understanding into rigid idols, hindering the very quest for deeper, more nuanced knowledge they were designed to facilitate. The historical resistance to heliocentrism, germ theory, evolution, quantum mechanics, or plate tectonics were all, in part, resistances to redefining fundamental concepts about the cosmos, life, matter, and Earth.

The drive to define, initially a tool for clarity, communication, and progress, risks becoming a barrier to understanding the undefined, the emergent, the fundamentally relational, or aspects of the cosmos that defy our current conceptual apparatus. The language used in science, relying on discrete terms, categories, and often binary distinctions (e.g., particle/wave, living/non-living, healthy/diseased), also implicitly shapes our perception and definition of reality, potentially imposing artificial boundaries where none exist in nature, a phenomenon explored in linguistics by the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis regarding the influence of language structure on thought, applied here metaphorically to scientific conceptual frameworks. Scientific terms are not neutral labels; they carry theoretical baggage and implicitly define the boundaries and perceived nature of the concept they represent. The choice of a metaphor or analogy in defining a new phenomenon (e.g., the “plum pudding” model of the atom, the “wave-particle duality,” the “meme” as a cultural replicator, the “information processing” model of the brain) can profoundly influence the subsequent research trajectory and the way the concept is understood, defined, and investigated, sometimes leading to the reification of the metaphor itself. These linguistic and conceptual frameworks, while necessary for communication and model building, can also constrain thought, making it difficult to conceive of phenomena that do not fit within the established linguistic and definitional structure. The very act of measurement, which is inextricably linked to definition (as operationalism highlights), is also theory-laden; what we choose to measure, how we measure it, and how we interpret the results are all guided by our pre-existing theoretical frameworks and definitions. This creates a recursive loop where theories inform definitions, definitions guide measurements, measurements refine theories, and so on, a process that can either lead to progressive refinement or circular validation within a limited framework. Furthermore, definitions often involve idealizations—simplifying assumptions that abstract away from the messy details of reality (e.g., a frictionless plane, a perfectly elastic collision, a point source of light, a rational economic actor). While essential for creating tractable models and

deriving general principles, these idealizations are inherently “wrong” in the sense that they do not precisely describe any real-world entity or phenomenon. They are useful fictions, but their utility relies on recognizing their fictional nature and understanding the limits of their applicability. Treating an idealized definition as a complete description of reality can lead to significant misunderstandings and failures when those assumptions break down in complex, real-world scenarios. The reliance on such idealizations underscores the constructive nature of scientific reality; we build our understanding using simplified conceptual blocks that are defined for theoretical convenience, rather than simply discovering pre-existing, perfectly formed boundaries in nature.

Philosophical perspectives offer profound critiques of this definitional imperative and implicit realism. Instrumentalism, for instance, views scientific theories and their definitions not as descriptions of an objective reality, but merely as useful tools or instruments for prediction and control. The “truth” of a definition or model is less important than its practical utility in manipulating or predicting phenomena; definitions are judged by their efficacy, not their ontological accuracy. Pragmatism similarly emphasizes the practical consequences and usefulness of concepts and theories over their supposed correspondence to an external truth, focusing on how well definitions “work” in practice within a given context and for a particular purpose, seeing knowledge as a tool for problem-solving rather than a mirror of reality. Conventionalism, as articulated by thinkers like Henri Poincaré or Pierre Duhem, suggests that fundamental scientific principles and definitions are not dictated solely by empirical evidence but are chosen, to some extent, based on convenience, simplicity, or convention. When faced with conflicting evidence, scientists have latitude in deciding whether to modify a fundamental definition or law, or to adjust auxiliary hypotheses or observational interpretations. This highlights the degree to which our scientific definitions are human constructs, chosen from potentially multiple consistent options, rather than uniquely determined by reality itself. Complexity science, while a scientific field itself, often adopts a perspective that de-emphasizes reductionist definition of individual components in favor of understanding the dynamics, interactions, and emergent properties of the system as a whole, recognizing that the “essence” of a complex phenomenon lies not in its isolated parts but in their organization and relationships, which are often fluid, context-dependent, and non-linear, making static, reductionist definition inherently limited. Network theory, for example, focuses on the relationships and connections between entities rather than defining the entities solely in isolation, offering a different lens through which to understand system behavior and properties that arise from connectivity. Critical Realism, in contrast to instrumentalism and positivism, maintains that there is a reality independent of our knowledge, but acknowledges that our access to it is mediated by our theoretical frameworks, social practices, and the limitations of our senses and instruments. It views scientific concepts and definitions not as direct mirrors of reality, but as fallible, historically contingent attempts to describe underlying causal mechanisms and structures that exist independently, recognizing the theory-laden nature of observation and definition and the distinction between the ‘real’ (the underlying causal structures), the ‘actual’ (what happens), and the ‘empirical’ (what is observed). Phenomenology, focusing on subjective experience and consciousness, highlights aspects of reality (the “lifeworld”) that resist objective, third-person operational definition, suggesting that scientific definitions capture only a particular, quantifiable, and decontextualized slice of human experience and the world, leaving out the rich, qualitative, and intersubjective dimensions. Constructivism, particularly social constructivism, argues that scientific knowledge, including definitions, is actively constructed by communities of scientists through social negotiation, cultural norms, and historical contexts, rather than being a passive discovery of pre-existing truths. Post-positivism acknowledges the goal of understanding reality but emphasizes that all knowledge is conjectural and fallible, requiring rigorous testing but accepting that definitive proof or absolute definition is unattainable. These alternative viewpoints highlight that science’s definitional approach is one specific strategy among potential others for engaging with reality, a strategy with particular strengths (predictive power, technological application, ability to build cumulative knowledge) but also significant limitations when confronted with aspects of the universe that resist static, isolated definition, are fundamentally relational, involve subjective experience, or operate at scales or complexities that defy current

descriptive tools. The very act of naming and classifying, while essential for communication and initial organization of knowledge, imposes boundaries on a reality that may be fundamentally interconnected and continuous, a challenge recognized in fields from taxonomy, which grapples with defining species boundaries in the face of evolution, hybridization, and horizontal gene transfer (especially in microorganisms), to fundamental physics, where the distinction between a particle and a field can become blurred or scale-dependent. Furthermore, the need to define unobservable entities (like quarks, virtual particles, dark matter, dark energy, consciousness, fundamental forces) forces science to rely heavily on indirect evidence, theoretical inference, mathematical constructs, and model-dependent interpretations, leading to definitions that are often highly abstract, contingent on the specific theoretical framework used, and susceptible to reification, treating theoretical constructs as if they were directly observed, independently existing objects. The process of idealization and abstraction, fundamental to scientific modeling and definition (e.g., defining a “point mass,” a “perfect vacuum,” a “rational agent”), further distances the definition from the messy, complex reality it attempts to represent, trading fidelity for tractability and generality, reinforcing the “wrong but useful” nature of scientific descriptions. Qualitative research methodologies in social sciences and humanities, for instance, often deliberately avoid imposing rigid, a priori definitions, seeking instead to understand phenomena through rich description, context, interpretation, and the exploration of meaning from the perspective of those involved, acknowledging the subjective and constructed nature of many human realities and standing in contrast to the quantitative sciences’ drive for objective, operational definition. Ultimately, the tension lies in the human need for cognitive structure, shared language, predictive models, and a sense of certainty, and the universe’s apparent indifference to our categories and its capacity for emergent complexity, scale-dependent behavior, and fundamental uncertainty. Navigating this tension requires a metacognitive awareness within science—a constant questioning of its own definitions, models, and underlying assumptions, recognizing them as provisional maps rather than the territory itself, thereby fostering intellectual humility, critical self-reflection, and openness essential for genuine exploration beyond the confines of current understanding. This involves embracing ambiguity, acknowledging the limits of current definitional frameworks, and being willing to revise or abandon deeply entrenched concepts when they cease to illuminate the territory or when anomalies accumulate. It necessitates a shift from viewing definitions as fixed endpoints of understanding to seeing them as dynamic starting points for exploration, flexible tools to be honed, expanded, or discarded as the quest for knowledge evolves and encounters new frontiers that defy existing conceptual boundaries. It requires acknowledging that some aspects of reality might be fundamentally indefinable in objective, reductionist terms, necessitating alternative modes of understanding, perhaps relying more on pattern recognition, relational mapping, or qualitative description where precise definition fails. The very structure of scientific questions is constrained by existing definitions; we tend to ask questions that can be answered within our defined frameworks, potentially missing crucial questions or phenomena that fall outside these boundaries. The history of science is replete with examples where a shift in definition (e.g., heat as caloric vs. kinetic energy, light as particle vs. wave, species as fixed vs. evolving) unlocked entirely new avenues of inquiry and understanding, demonstrating the generative power of redefining concepts. However, the initial resistance to such redefinitions highlights the inertia inherent in established conceptual frameworks. The future of understanding complex phenomena, from consciousness to the universe’s fundamental nature, may hinge not just on discovering new facts, but on our willingness and ability to transcend or radically revise our most cherished definitions.